

The Rutland Herald.

"LIBERTY AND UNION, NOW AND FOREVER ONE AND INSEPARABLE."—JEFFERSON.

VOLUME XLII.

RUTLAND, Tuesday, April 12, 1836.

NUMBER 16.

The Rutland Herald.

PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY, AT RUTLAND, VT. BY
WILLIAM FAY.

POETRY.

MELODY.

BY WILLIAM LEGGERT.

If you bright stars which gem the night
Be each a blissful dwelling sphere;
Where kindred spirits reunite
Whom Death has torn asunder here,
How sweet it were at once to die,
And leave this blighted orb afar!
Mix soul and soul to cleave the sky,
And soar away from star to star!

But ah! how dark, how drear, how lone
Would seem the brightest world of bliss,
If wandering through each radiant one,
We failed to find the loved of this!
If there no more the trees shall twine,
Which Death's cold hand alone can sever,
Ah! then those stars that once so bright
More hateful, as they shine for ever!

It cannot be—each hope and fear,
That lights the eye, or clouds the brow,
Proclaims there is a happier sphere
Than this bleak world that holds us now!
There is a voice which sorrow hears,
When heaviness weighs life's galling chain;
Tis Heaven that whispers "dry thy tears,"
The pure in heart shall meet again!

Miscellany.

"A VOICE FROM THE GALLOWS."

The following is the letter we have referred to as having been written by Crockett the night before his execution. The original is in possession of the Rev. E. T. Taylor, who has furnished a copy for publication in *Zion's Herald*.—*Boston Daily Times*.

BOSTON JAIL, Feb. 15, 1836.

"Under a deep sense of my situation, I write a few lines, which I leave in the hands of Mr. E. T. Taylor. I will leave them to show how I came here. I never was inclined to lie, cheat or steal for a living; but designed to get it honestly, by labor. And it would have been so to this day, if I had not fallen into bad company. I never was accustomed to crime. My mind has always been far from it; and I never should have been engaged in this, if they had not caught me intoxicated. I knew not what I was about, nor where they were getting me to."

"Now I feel the effect of falling into bad company. I would warn my young friends to keep out of it, and never to drink ardent spirits. I consider it the surest weapon a man can use to take his life with, and make him eternally miserable. I would warn you as a dying friend in the name of God, to abstain from drinking, for 'where Rum is in wit is out.' The Devil is always ready to aid in doing mischief. He will lead a man into trouble and leave him to get out as he can. But remember you have to pass through the course of law, to get out; and when you are inclosed within walls of stone you will begin to reflect upon your past life, and wish you had read your Bible, and attended meetings on the Sabbath, and remained at home evenings with your wives, or at your boarding houses. Then your wives would not have to obtain permission of the Jail Keeper to allow them to converse with you through the little trap door, and weep over you, and return home with broken hearts to say, 'Rum and brandy put our husbands in Jail!'"

"No wonder that so many crimes are committed by the drunkard!—for his brains are boiling in alcohol. It changes the man to a beast, and destroys the finer works of nature."

A HORRIBLE PLOT TO ENTROP A FEMALE. A transaction showing the most diabolical wickedness, has recently been developed. A young orphan lady residing in or near Barnet, Vt. was beset by Gen. C—, (formerly a candidate for Congress) with the most insulting proposals. These she indignantly rejected, and came to reside with an aunt in Boston. Gen. C— went to New York. A young man named McClintock, with whom the young lady had been acquainted in Vermont, called on her in Boston and invited her to ride with him to Worcester on the railroad; to which she consented. On their arrival there, he informed her that he must go to Hartford; but she strenuously resisted going for some time, when finding him determined, and fearing to return to the city alone, and being without money she consented to accompany him. On arriving at Hartford, he informed her that he should take the stage the next morning for Boston; but he deceived her, and went on board the New Haven stage. There he imposed on her again by pretending to take the Providence, when in fact he took the New York boat. On arriving at New York she was hastily placed in a carriage, when to her astonishment and horror, she found herself in company with Gen. C—! "Now I've got you," said the monster. She was whirled away to a house of questionable fame, and every effort made by C— to tempt her into the path of dishonor and ruin; but she resisted all his efforts, and declared she would part with her virtue only with her life. C— finding he had gone too far for his own safety, placed her again under the charge of McClintock, who started with her for Boston. After leaving New Haven some suspicions were started, and several gentlemen pursued and overtook them at Hartford. On making known their errand, she joyfully threw herself on their protection, and has been returned to her friends. Her inhuman kidnapper was suffered to escape, and as well as his diabolical employer, still goes unwhipped of justice.

Upon the above the Editor of the Springfield Republican remarks—

"We find this article without credit, and know not in what paper it first appeared, but learn that it is incorrect so far as relates to the circumstances of detection. Soon after the parties left Treat's Hotel in Hartford, on their way to New York, it

was discovered that the young lady had made known her situation to some one in the house; that she had no change of dress, &c. Mr. Treat started immediately in pursuit and went to New York, but not missed them. On his return he found McClintock and the young lady at his house, having been detained there by his kind family. Here McClintock was made to pay the expense of the pursuit, and of conveying her home to Vermont; and Mr. Treat passed through this town a few days after, with the young lady in charge."

Lamentable Depravity. On Tuesday, a young man was arrested by two of the Police officers, on a charge of burglary, but his examination has not yet taken place, and the circumstances connected with it, cannot in consequence be made public.

He was discharged at the February term on a charge nearly similar, for reasons best known to those in authority, but he has proved that he is a most hardened wretch.

On searching his pocket the following copy of a letter, addressed to a young lady, was found, and we give it entire, to show that his talents and education have been most woefully perverted:

"I have been the child of misfortune. The current of my life from the earliest period I can recollect, has been dark and troubled. Few gleams of sunshine have ever brightened the stream, and when they did dance for a moment, on a passing joyous ripple that ruffled its surface, it was to give place to heavy clouds, under whose lowering shadow it again assumed its usual leaden hue.

"Oh E—! how is it to be? You have—so from your own account suffered much from loss of fortune, and of near and dear friends. Oh! may not this sad occurrence prove a lasting benefit to us, if we are never to meet again—but we must not give way to our feelings. We have a duty to perform to ourselves, and friends and each other; our friends, did I say? I have no friend. But we have a duty to perform to the All-Glorious Being, who has blessed us with health and strength thus far. I am here I confess a sinner, but am determined to sin no more if I can help it; but through the blessings of divine providence I am determined to set out and gain the promised land."

The letter appears to have been written during his confinement at Bellevue, and is certainly a creditable performance. His friends, for he has friends, and his mother are most deeply affected at the iniquitous course he has been pursuing.—*N. Y. Herald*.

Dress cannot ease pain, promote health, assist the needy, or soothe the afflicted; but, on the contrary, it often robs them of their just dues.

Political.

MASSACHUSETTS. An adjourned Convention of the members of the Massachusetts Legislature, and of delegates chosen from the various towns in the State not represented by Whigs, was held in Boston on the 24th ult. Governor EVERETT, and Lieut. Governor HULL were nominated for re-election. The following Letter from the Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER to a friend in Boston was read to the Convention.

Washington, February 27, 1836.

My dear sir,—The Whig Members of the Legislature of Massachusetts, of the last year, saw fit to put me in nomination for the office of President of the U. S.

Events have since occurred, which were probably not anticipated, and which may be thought to have rendered a reconsideration of that nomination expedient. If this opinion should be entertained by the Whig Members of the present Legislature, I should exceedingly regret that they should forbear to act upon it, from any motive of delicacy towards me. Indeed, in the state of things at present existing in the country, my personal wishes are, to withdraw my name from the place which it occupies before the public, in connexion with the approaching election; and I am restrained from so doing, only by the consideration, that there are interests, which might be affected by such a movement, in regard to which the opinions of others ought to be consulted.

I wish you, therefore, my dear sir, to signify to my friends, that not only would it give me no pain to be no longer considered a candidate, but that in my relations to the country would be altogether agreeable to my personal feelings. At the same time, I wish it may also be said to them, that I shall not act in opposition to their judgment, of what is required by the public good. I shall not separate from them, nor from those principles which we have hitherto maintained, and which, I trust, we shall continue to maintain, whether in majorities or minorities, or in prosperous or adverse fortune.—If in their opinion our common principles and common cause, notwithstanding what has occurred, do still require of me, that I remain in my present position, I shall cheerfully abide by their determination, confident, that in no events hereafter to happen, can it become matter of regret to me, that I have conformed to what seemed best to their honest patriotism and intelligent sense of public duty.

With this distinct expression of my own personal wishes, therefore, I leave the subject for their decision; desiring them to consider nothing, but what just and consistent principle, sincere patriotic duty, and the great cause of Constitutional Liberty may appear, in the present posture of public affairs, to demand from them and from me.

With very true regard,

Your obedient servant,

DANIEL WEBSTER.

To H. W. KINSMAN, Esq.

After the Letter had been read, a Committee, appointed for the purpose, reported a series of resolutions, in which the Convention express their determination to adhere to the nomination of Mr. WEBSTER for the Presidency, and recommend FRANCIS GRANGER as a candidate for the Vice-Presidency. The resolutions were unanimously adopted. Another State Convention is to be held at Worcester, on the second Wednesday in September, for the nomination of Electors.

Congressional Debates.

MR. SLADES SPEECH.

Against the gentleman from Virginia says the "local legislature of this District cannot enter into any treaty, alliance or confederation, grant letters of marque and reprisal, coin money," &c. and infers, if I understand him that because this disability results, as he supposes, by implication from the inhibition to the states of the exercise of these powers, therefore the assumed disability of Congress to abolish slavery and the slave trade in this District, may, in like manner, result from its want of power to put an end to these evils in the States.

The whole of this argument rests on a false supposition with regard to the source of the inability of Congress, as a Legislature for this District, to make treaties, grant letters of marque, and coin money; and falls to the ground when it is perceived that that inability results, not from the inhibition to the states of the exercise of such powers, but from their utter inconsistency with both the purposes for which the power to legislate over this District was granted, and the relation which the District evidently bears to the Union.

The gentleman from Virginia next proceeds to lay down the following general rules to restrain legislation over this District:

1. "That nothing which Congress is expressly prohibited by the Constitution from doing as a 'National Legislature,' can it do as a local Legislature for the District of Columbia."

2. "That all the duties and obligations which 'the States are bound by the Constitution to discharge and observe, from one to the other, the 'District of Columbia, or its Legislature, is bound to discharge and observe towards the States, respectively.'"

3. "That the Local Legislature of the District of Columbia can do no act, or pass no law, which 'the States are prohibited from doing or passing by the Constitution.'"

And how let it be asked, do these rules affect the present question? No express prohibition to legislate on the subject of State Slavery is found in the Constitution unless it be in the amendment which provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." But if Congress cannot legislate on the subject of slavery in this District, because the right to legislate upon it in the States is "reserved to the States," how is it to legislate for the District at all? The subjects of every day legislation for the District are subjects upon which Congress has no power to legislate for the States, and are, therefore, according to the gentleman's argument, subjects on which it has no right to legislate here.

And how let it be asked, do these rules touch the subject? Are the States bound by their "duties and obligations" towards each other to refrain from abolishing Slavery and the Slave trade within their respective limits? Nobody pretends this.

Many States have done it; and many more may yet do it, for any thing that can be found to the contrary in the Constitution. And can any greater evil result to any of the slave States from the exercise of a power by Congress to abolish slavery and the Slave trade within the limits of this District, than would result from the exercise by the States of their admitted power of doing the same thing within their limits? May not Maryland, for example, if she chose, put an end to these evils within her limits? And would not the exercise of the power be as dangerous to the peace of the South, as would be the exercise of the same power by Congress in regard to this District?

And has the gentleman's third rule a more appropriate application to the present question than either of the others? To what purpose, in reference to this argument is it to say that Congress can pass no law in reference to the District which the States are prohibited from passing? Are the States prohibited from passing laws abolishing Slavery and the Slave trade within their respective limits?

The gentleman from Virginia says, the Constitution declares that "private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation." Supposing this to be an application to the present case, only involves the inquiry, whether slaves can be rightfully emancipated by legislative authority, without providing a just compensation to their masters. This touches a question which I will not now discuss, namely: what is the foundation of the right to the slave, which is said to be vested in the master? Congress, however, are not asked to take private property for public use; but to free the African from the unnatural condition of being the property of another, to the end, not that he may become the property of the public, but the proprietor of himself. But this is not all we are called on to do. We are asked to prohibit men from making merchandise of their fellow men; from lying and selling them to get gain.—Do gentlemen talk of a compensation to the slave merchant for the loss of such a privilege? Do they even touch the subject of the Slave trade within this District? Dare they do it? Are there any "vested rights" in the way of legislation on this subject? Is there any question about compensation involved? Any limitation growing out of "the nature of society, and of government," to which the gentleman from Virginia refers—any express or implied infringement of the rights of the States?—any kind of an obstacle in short, but the want of a will in those who have the power to put down this abominable traffic.

Having thus attempted to show that the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of these petitions, is obviously included in the power to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever," is not restrained by any natural limitations of legislative power, nor by any express or implied limitations to be found in the Constitution, the question arises—Where is the limitation to be found for which gentlemen so earnestly contend?—I am answered—in the acts of cession, by which the States of Virginia and Maryland ceded the territory which forms this District to the U. S.—These acts, say gentlemen, are conclusive upon the subject. Let us see, then, if these States did

in making the cession, actually impose restrictions at variance with the plain language of the Constitution; and whether Congress accepted grants thus restricted.

The cession from Virginia was made by act of legislature of that State on the third of Dec. 1789, in the following words:

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That a tract of country, not exceeding ten miles square, or any lesser quantity, to be located within the limits of the State, and in any part thereof, as Congress may, by law, direct, shall be and the same is hereby forever ceded and relinquished to the Congress and Government of the U. States in full and absolute right and exclusive jurisdiction, as well of soil as of persons residing or to reside therein pursuant to the tenor and effect of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution of the Government of the U. S."

This grant it will be perceived transfers to the U. S. "exclusive jurisdiction of soil and persons residing, or to reside therein;" and adds, "pursuant to the tenor and effect of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution of the Government of the United States;" that is pursuant to that of the Constitution which, as we have seen, expressly grants to Congress the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever."—Here, then instead of a restriction of the jurisdiction contemplated in the Constitution there is, both in direct terms, and by reference to that instrument, an express and clear confirmation of it.

But, say gentlemen, there is a proviso which follows this grant, that contains the limitation conceded for. Let us see. The proviso is as follows: "Provided that nothing herein contained shall be construed to vest in the United States any right of property in the soil, or to affect the rights of individuals therein, otherwise than the same shall or may be transferred by such individuals to the United States." Now, sir, is it not apparent, upon the slightest inspection of this proviso, that it limited the grant only so far as it extended to the soil, and was designed merely to protect the rights of individuals therein—that is in the soil—from the operation of that part of the cession which grants "the tract of country" to the United States "in full and absolute right?"—It seems to me, indeed, that, so far from limiting the grant in reference to the subject matter now under consideration, this very proviso does, in effect confirm it, since an express exception of one species of right from the operation of the grant, and one only, would seem to imply an exclusion of all other exceptions. It is, indeed, altogether incredible, that the Legislatures of Virginia and Maryland should have intended to restrict the U. States in their powers over the subject of slavery, without using language which would directly, or by clear implication, reach the point.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wise) gives additional force to this argument by asking— "Why was the cession required? Why was the [ceding States] consent to the purchase of 'places required by the Constitution, if it was not 'to give the States the power of imposing condition and restraint upon your legislation over the ceded territory?'"

"The power of imposing condition and restraint?" Very well. If this was the purpose, the States of Virginia and Maryland of course understood it and would take care to impose in their grants, all the conditions and restraints upon the legislation of Congress which they thought proper; and to do so so plainly that even the way-faring man need not err in regard to them. Now, where are the condition and restraints on which gentlemen rely?—I have recited the whole; and who will say that they embrace any restraint upon the power of Congress touching the subject under consideration? Is not the omission upon the gentleman's own view of the subject, decisive of the question?

But the gentleman having looked into the grant and seeing that no such "condition and restraint" was imposed there, seeks to find it in "the nature of society and government in Maryland and Virginia," which he says is "of itself, independent of conditions expressed in the acts of cession, sufficient to restrain your power of legislation over this subject." Thus, at one moment, a cession was moved for in the Constitution, to the end that the ceding states might impose condition and restraint upon the legislation of Congress; and at the next "the nature of society and government in Maryland and Virginia is of itself a sufficient restraint," without any thing expressed in the grant!

But, Mr. Speaker, what is the condition of the people of this district in regard to this important subject, if the power, contended for is not granted to Congress? Maryland and Virginia, possessing the power to abolish slavery and the slave trade within their respective limits, had the power of doing it within the territory which now composes this district. But they possess it no longer.—Their jurisdiction here is extinguished. The inhabitants of the territory are transferred to the U. States entirely divested of all civil jurisdiction; with no power to legislate on this or any other subject, but subjected to the "exclusive legislation" of Congress in "all cases whatsoever." However much they may, at any time, desire to free the territory from the curse of slavery and the slave trade, they are powerless. For any thing they can do by the force of law, they and their children, and their children's children, to the latest time, must be doomed to see among them a traffic which makes merchandise of the bodies and the souls of their fellow men; which marches through their streets chained together, companies of human beings destined to the slave prison and the slave ship; and which agonizes their moral sensibilities by a severance of all the ties which bind men to his fellow-man, in the most valued and endearing relations of human life.

I have thus shown that the power given to Congress over this subject, by the general grant in the Constitution, is affected, neither by the natural limitations to the exercise of legislative power nor by any limitation, express, or implied, in the constitution itself, nor by any contained in the cessions of this territory by the states of Maryland and Virginia.

* The grant from Maryland was made on the 13th of December, 1791. It is in the same language as the grant from Virginia, and is limited by the same proviso.

But the petitioners are here met with another objection to granting the prayer of these petitions. It is made a question of public safety. To begin the work of abolishing slavery, and to banish the detestable traffic in human flesh from this district, will, we are told, tend to excite a spirit of insurrection in the Southern States; and gentlemen give full rein to their imaginations in depicting the horrors of rape, rapine and murder which will follow. I do not permit myself to doubt the perfect sincerity of gentlemen in these gloomy forebodings. I know they are in a position to see what I cannot see, and feel what I cannot feel. I will not allow myself to trifle with their views or feelings on this subject, though I must be permitted to doubt the correctness of the one, and the justice of the other.

And may I not well doubt? It is true I do not profess a very familiar acquaintance with the disposition of the slave population, or the probable influence upon them of a discussion of, and action upon, this subject. And while I would hesitate to express my own individual opinion to the assertions of honorable gentlemen, so confidently made, they must permit me to confront them, not altogether with my own opinion, but with the authority of intelligent and respectable slaveholders themselves.

I hold in my hand a petition presented to this House in the year 1828, signed by more than eleven hundred citizens of this district, praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade within its limits. It was referred to the committee on the District of Columbia, and remained unacted on until the last session, when it was called up, on motion of an honorable member from New Hampshire, (Mr. Hubbard,) and ordered to be printed, with the names of the signers. I send it to the Chair, and ask that it may be read by the clerk.

Here Mr. Garland, of Virginia, interposed and said he should object to the reading of that and all other petitions on the subject, unless the gentleman used it as a part of his argument.

Mr. Slade replied that he intended, so to use it, and should read it himself, but being exhausted, he wished it read by the clerk.

Mr. Garland withdrew his objection, and consented to the reading as an act of courtesy to Mr. Slade.

The petition was then read by the clerk as follows:

"To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We the undersigned, citizens of the counties of Washington and Alexandria, in the district of Columbia, beg leave to call the attention of your honorable body to an evil of serious magnitude, which greatly impairs the prosperity and happiness of this district, and casts the reproach of inconsistency upon the free institutions established among us.

"While the laws of the United States denounce the foreign slave trade as piracy, and punish with death those who engage in it, the domestic slave trade, there exists in this district, the seat of the National Government, a domestic slave trade scarcely less disgraceful in its character, and even more demoralizing in its influence. For this is not, like the former, carried on against a barbarous nation—its victims are reared up among the people of this country, educated in the precepts of the same religion, and imbued with similar domestic attachments.

"These people are, without their consent, torn from their homes; husband and wife are frequently separated and sold into different parts; children are taken from their parents, without regard to the ties of nature; and the most endearing bonds of affection are broken for ever.

"Nor is this traffic confined to those who are legally slaves for life. Some who are entitled to freedom, and many who have a limited time to serve, are sold into unconditional slavery; and, owing to the defectiveness of our laws, they are generally carried out of the district before the necessary steps can be taken for their release.

"We behold these scenes continually taking place among us, and lament our inability to prevent them. The people of this district, have within themselves, no means of legislative redress; and we therefore appeal to your honorable body, as the only one invested by the American Constitution with the power to relieve us.

"Nor is it only from the rapacity of slave traders that the colored race in this district are doomed to suffer. Even the laws which govern us sanction and direct, in certain cases, a procedure that we believe as unparalleled, in giving injustice, by anything at present known among the Governments of Christendom. An instance of the operations of these laws, which occurred during the last summer, we will briefly relate:

"A colored man, who stated that he was entitled to freedom, was taken up as a runaway slave, and lodged in the jail of Washington city. He was advertised, but no one appearing to claim him, he was according to law, put up at public auction for the payment of his jail fees, and sold as a slave for life! He was purchased by a slave trader, who was not required to give security for his remaining in the district, and he was soon after shipped at Alexandria for one of the Southern States. An attempt was made by some benevolent individuals to have the sale postponed until his claim to freedom could be investigated; but their efforts were unavailing; and thus was a human being sold into perpetual bondage at the capital of the freest Government on earth, without even a pretence of trial, or an allegation of crime.

"We blush for our country while we relate this disgraceful transaction, and we would fain conceal it from the world, did not its very enormity inspire us with the hope that it will rouse the philanthropist and the patriot to exertion. We have no hesitation in believing your honorable body never intended that this odious law should be enforced; it was adopted with the old code of Maryland, from which we believe, it has been expunged since the district was ceded to the General Government.

"The fact of its having been so recently executed, shows the necessity of this subject being investigated by a power which we confidently hope will be ready to correct it.

"We are aware of the difficulties that would attend any attempt to relieve us from these grievances by a sudden emancipation of the slaves in this district, and we would the more be far from recom-